



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,752	02/11/2004	Christopher D.W. Jones	JONES 4-22-67	3615
47396	7590	01/25/2005	EXAMINER	
HITT GAINES, PC AGERE SYSTEMS INC. PO BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			PHAM, HOAI V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/776,752

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

Hoai v. Pham

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/9/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kayaoka et al. [U.S. Pat. 5,527,730] newly cited.

With respect to claim 1, Kayaoka et al. (figs. 24-25 and cols. 25-26) discloses a method of forming a semiconductor device, comprising:

simultaneously forming first electrodes (1718) adjacent each other on a substrate (1611), the first electrodes (1718) comprising a metal (see fig. 24D);

forming a dielectric layer (1719) between the first electrodes (1718) (see fig. 24E); and

creating a second electrode (1720) comprising the metal between the first electrodes (1718), the second electrode (1720) contacting the dielectric layer (1719) between the first electrodes (1718) to thereby form adjacent interdigitated electrodes (see fig. 5b).

With respect to claim 2, Kayaoka et al. discloses producing a first conductive layer (1714) over the substrate (1611) prior to simultaneously forming and wherein

Art Unit: 2814

simultaneously forming includes simultaneously forming the first electrodes (1718) on the first conductive layer (1714), the conductive layer interconnecting the first electrodes (see figs. 24C-24D, col. 25, lines 24-39).

With respect to claim 3, Kayaoka et al. discloses that forming a dielectric layer (1719) includes forming the dielectric layer (1719) over and between the first electrodes (1718) and creating a second electrode (1720) includes creating an electrode layer over and between the first electrodes to form interconnected second electrodes over and between the first electrodes (1718) (see figs. 24E-24F, col. 25, lines 38-46).

With respect to claim 8, Kayaoka et al. (figs. 24-25 and cols. 25-26) discloses a method of manufacturing an integrated circuit, comprising:

- forming active or passive devices over a substrate (1611);
- creating an interdigitated capacitor over the substrate, including:
 - placing a first conductive layer (1714) over the substrate (1611) (see fig. 24C),
 - simultaneously forming first electrodes (1718) adjacent each other on the first conductive layer (1714), the first conductive layer (1714) interconnecting the first electrodes (1718) (see fig. 24D),
 - forming a dielectric layer (1719) over and between the first electrodes (1718) and on the first conductive layer (1714) (see fig. 4b), and

depositing an electrode layer (1720) over and between the first electrodes (1718), the second electrode (1720) to form interconnected second electrode (1720) over and between the first electrodes (1718) (see fig. 24F); and

interconnecting the active or passive devices and the interdigitated capacitor by a contact stud (1622) to form an operative integrated circuit (see fig. 24G).

With respect to claim 12, Kayaoka et al. discloses that forming a dielectric layer (1719) includes forming a dielectric layer (Al_2O_3) having a high dielectric constant (see col. 25, lines 58-59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2814

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayaoka et al. [U.S. Pat. 5,527,730] newly cited, in view of Shih et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,436,787] Applicant IDS.

Kayaoka et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed above except: a first barrier layer located between the first electrodes and the dielectric layer; and a second barrier layer located between the dielectric layer and the second electrodes. However, Shih et al. discloses the first barrier layer (26) located between the first electrodes (24) and the dielectric layer (28), and a second barrier layer (30) located between the dielectric layer and the second electrodes (34) to prevent copper ions from diffusing into the dielectric layer thereby reducing the leakage current (see fig. 3, col. 3, lines 10-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the first and second barrier layers as taught by Shih et al. into the device of Gupta et al. in order to reduce the leakage current (see col. 3, lines 10-46).

6. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayaoka et al. [U.S. Pat. 5,527,730] newly cited.

Kayaoka et al. does not teach the exact an aspect ratio range of their first electrode, as claimed by Applicant. However, the aspect ratio range would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan practicing the invention because, absent evidence of disclosure of criticality for the range giving unexpected results, it is not inventive to

discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions of any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is aid to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. See *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayaoka et al. [U.S. Pat. 5,527,730] newly cited, in view of Quek et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,436,787] previously applied.

With respect to claims 13-14, Kayaoka et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed above except: the first electrodes, the first conductive layer, and the electrode layer are comprised of substantially the same material. However, Quek et al. discloses that it is well known in the art for the first electrodes (40a), the first conductive layer (36), and the electrode layer (46b") comprising of substantially the same material (see col. 5, lines 50-53 and col. 8, lines 56-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the same material for the first electrodes, the first conductive layer, and the electrode layer as taught by Quek et al. into the process of Kayaoka et al. to form the capacitor.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4-5 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoai v. Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1715. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**HOAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER**